

REMARKS

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate features of claims 7, 12 and 13. Claims 2, 3, 4, 8 and 11 have been amended to correspond to changes in claim 1. Claims 7, 12 and 13 have been deleted.

The specification has been amended to further describe the combining means of an extension portion according to Fig. 2 that is amended and attached with this response. The applicant believes no new matter is incurred because additional descriptions in the claims and specification are faithfully corresponding to the original Fig. 2.

According to the Examiner's contentions, Yeh's patent teaches all limitations in original claim 1 of the present application except the second end of the frame including a first casing and a removable second casing mounted on the first casing recited in claim 13. Response to this, claim 1 has been amended to combine with features in original claims 12 and 13 and another feature of a combining elements including ears and hooks those are not shown in Ming-Hui's patent.

Specifically, Fig. 2 as amended (and Figure 3) in the present application clearly demonstrates the ears 105 on the shells 10 and hooks 511, 521 on the casing 51, 52. Thereby, the first casing 51 and the second casing 51 are directly pressed to hook the hook 511, 521 into the ears 105.

According to description in Ming-Hui's patent, the first cover 50 has arms 501 for clamping the transverse bar 22 when the first shell and the second shell are assembled together (see column 2, lines 67 to column 3, line 2). Therefore, when the first cover is attached on the electronic card, the arms 501 has to be obliquely inserted into a seam between the first and second shells and pivotally pressed down to snugly combine with second cover 52. Thus, methods of combination of the present application and Ming-Hui's patent are not the same. Inserting the arms 501 into the seam between the first and second shells in oblique would prop the two shells and cause deformation or even disengagement of the two shells. Therefore, the two types of combining elements in the present application and Ming-Hui's patent do not have the same way (directly pressed v.s. pivotally pressed) and same result (tight combination v.s. deformed combination of two corresponding shells).

Since the extension portion is not shown in Yeh's patent, the amended claim 1 has a feature of combining elements that are not shown in Yeh's patent and the rejection based on U.S.C. 102 (b) is overcome. Moreover, Ming-Hui's patent does not teach the same substitution of combining elements. Rejection of U.S.C. 103(a) anticipated by Ming-Hui's patent no longer exists after the claim 1 is amended.


BEST AVAILABLE COPY

The Examiner has cited the United States patents listed in NOTICE OF REFERENCES CITED as C-G. By the lack of application of these references and others like them within the classes or subclasses searched, the Examiner apparently recognizes the clear patentability of the present invention over any of these references.

Therefore, since the claims of the present application have been shown to include limitations directed to the features of applicant's electronic card which are neither shown, described, taught, nor alluded to in any of the references cited by the Examiner, whether those references are taken singly or in any combination, the Examiner is requested to allow claims 1-6 and 8-11, as originally filed, of the present application and to pass this application to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

Frank Lin



Dated: December 27, 2005.

Alan D. Kamrath, Reg. No. 28,227
NIKOLAI & MERSEREAU, P.A.
Attorneys for Applicant
900 Second Avenue South
Suite 820 International Centre
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Tel: (612) 392-7306
Fax: (612) 349-6556

BEST AVAILABLE COPY